

Refugee Review Tribunal

AUSTRALIA

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: IND30787
Country: India
Date: 3 November 2006

Keywords: India – Tamil Nadu – MDMK – AIADMK – Tauhid Jamad – Muslims –
Conversions – Hindus

This response was prepared by the Country Research Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum.

Questions

1. Did the MDMK form an alliance with the AIADMK around April 2006?
2. If so, is there evidence that this was opposed by MDMK members?
3. Please provide information on Tauhid Jamad and its activities.
4. Is there any evidence that members of Tauhid Jamad are targeted by the authorities or others?
5. Is there any evidence that it engages in conversion of low-caste Hindus to Islam?
6. What is the attitude of the Indian and Tamil Nadu authorities to Muslims who seek to convert Hindus?
7. Have there been any reports of Muslims in Tamil Nadu suffering harm from groups such as the VHP for involvement in converting Hindus?
8. What is the current situation for supporters of the MDMK? Do they face harm from the government or others?
9. How did the MDMK perform at the 2006 Tamil Nadu election?

RESPONSE

1. Did the MDMK form an alliance with the AIADMK around April 2006?

An article in *The Hindu* dated 5 March 2006 indicates that the MDMK formed an alliance with the AIADMK in Tamil Nadu in March 2006. It is stated in the article that:

The Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (MDMK) has struck an alliance with Tamil Nadu's ruling All-India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK). MDMK general secretary Vaiko called on AIADMK general secretary and Chief Minister Jayalalithaa at her Poes Garden residence here on Saturday and together they announced that the MDMK would contest 35 seats in the May 8 Assembly elections.

The article also indicates that "Mr. Vaiko later told a press conference that despite the electoral ties with the AIADMK, the MDMK would be "part and parcel of the United

Progressive Alliance (UPA)” at the Centre and would continue to extend issue-based support to the Manmohan Singh Government from outside just as the Left parties were doing. “We will convey our decision to the UPA chairperson at the appropriate time”” (‘Vaiko strikes poll alliance with AIADMK’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March – Attachment 1).

Another article in *The Statesman* dated 5 March 2006 notes that “MDMK general secretary Mr Vaiko gave a shock to the Opposition in Tamil Nadu today by pulling out of the DMK-led Democratic Progressive Alliance (DPA). Mr Vaiko is now in the company of Chief Minister and AIADMK general secretary, Miss J Jayalalitha. He announced himself as an ally of his former foe, whom he had been describing until recently as an unpardonable autocrat.” The article also notes that Mr Vaiko, who had previously been imprisoned “by the AIADMK regime for about 19 months” under the POTA [Prevention of Terrorism Act], had “dismissed his Pota imprisonment by the AIADMK regime” and had “said there was nothing strange in the alliance with the AIADMK. Miss Jayalalitha mouthed a cliché, saying there are no permanent enemies in politics. The AIADMKs doors were still open for allies and a few more could join, she said” (‘Vaiko joins Jaya ranks’ 2006, *The Statesman*, 5 March – Attachment 2).

2. If so, is there evidence that this was opposed by MDMK members?

The previously mentioned article in *The Hindu* dated 5 March 2006 indicates that MDMK general secretary Vaiko and AIADMK general secretary and Chief Minister Jayalalithaa had “said activists of the two parties would work wholeheartedly for each other’s victory” (‘Vaiko strikes poll alliance with AIADMK’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March – Attachment 1).

A further article in *The Hindu* dated 5 March 2006 notes that:

Jubilant MDMK cadres, welcoming their general secretary Vaiko’s decision to align with the AIADMK, burst crackers and distributed sweets in Karur on Saturday.

Addressing the media, the party district secretary Monjanur P. Ramasamy said the decision reflected the unanimous view of the cadres (‘MDMK cadres happy’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March – Attachment 3).

However, another article dated 2 April 2006 indicates that “on March 19, around 50 MDMK cadres from the Thanthoni Union left their sanctuary to join DMK, ‘unable to digest’ the party general secretary, Vaiko’s decision to align with the AIADMK. They all joined the DMK in the presence of its district secretary and Karur constituency candidate, Vasuki Murugesan” (‘75 DMK members join AIADMK’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 2 April – Attachment 4).

3. Please provide information on Tauhid Jamad and its activities.

4. Is there any evidence that members of Tauhid Jamad are targeted by the authorities or others?

5. Is there any evidence that it engages in conversion of low-caste Hindus to Islam?

A search of the sources consulted found no information regarding Tauhid Jamad and its activities, whether there is any evidence that members of Tauhid Jamad are targeted by the authorities or others, and whether there is any evidence that it engages in conversion of low-caste Hindus to Islam.

6. What is the attitude of the Indian and Tamil Nadu authorities to Muslims who seek to convert Hindus?

The US Department of State report on religious freedom in India for 2006 does not specifically provide information regarding the attitude of the Indian and Tamil Nadu authorities to Muslims who seek to convert Hindus. However, the report does indicate that “Conversion continued to be a highly contentious issue” and that “Several state governments, most recently the Government of Rajasthan, enacted laws to criminalize coerced and/or fraudulent conversions. Some nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) claimed some state governments used these laws to restrict voluntary conversions and to harass religious minorities.” The report also notes that:

The constitution provides for freedom of religion, and the Government generally respected this right in practice. However, the Government sometimes did not act swiftly enough to counter effectively societal attacks against religious minorities and attempts by some leaders of state and local governments to limit religious freedom. This resulted in part from legal constraints on national government action inherent in the country’s federal structure and from shortcomings in its law enforcement and justice systems, although courts regularly upheld the constitutional provision of religious freedom. Despite Government efforts to foster communal harmony, some extremists continued to view ineffective investigation and prosecution of attacks on religious minorities, particularly at the state and local level, as a signal that they could commit such violence with impunity, although numerous cases were in the courts at the end of the reporting period (US Department of State 2006, *International Religious Freedom Report 2006 – India*, September, Introduction – Attachment 5).

A RRT research response dated 25 August 2006 includes information on Muslim assistance to Dalit communities in Tamil Nadu and the response of Hindu nationalist groups to the conversion of Hindu Dalits to Islam in that state (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30453*, 25 August – Attachment 6).

Another RRT research response dated 6 February 2006, although in relation to Christians, includes information on an anti-conversion law enacted in the state of Tamil Nadu in 2002 and then repealed in 2004 (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17783*, 6 February – Attachment 7).

An article dated 18 May 2004 indicates that Tamil Nadu’s Chief Minister Jayalalitha had “withdrawn a series of political decisions taken in the last two years”, including “a controversial ban on religious conversions” following “a huge defeat in recent national elections” for her party, the AIADMK. It is stated in the article that:

The law was strongly opposed by Christians, Muslims and low caste Hindus as an attempt to curb freedom of religious practise.

Political observers say this step may have brought the AIADMK closer to the Bharatiya Janata Party - the main constituent in the governing coalition - but alienated many Muslims and Christians opposed to the anti-conversion law.

In last week’s parliamentary elections, the AIADMK-BJP alliance could not win even one of the 40 seats in Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry and lost heavily to a powerful alliance comprising the regional Dravida Munnetra Kazakham (DMK) party and the Congress party (Kumar, Sampath 2004, ‘Jayalalitha makes sudden U-turn’, *BBC News*, 18 May

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3725231.stm - Accessed 2 November 2006 – Attachment 8).

According to an article in *The Hindu* dated 22 May 2005, Tamil Nadu's chief minister Ms Jayalalithaa had made "it clear that the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Forcible Conversion of Religion (TNPFCR) Act, 2002 was no longer in vogue as it was repealed through an Ordinance last year." According to the article, "Though the Ordinance through which the TNPFCR Act was repealed had lapsed, there was no scope for its revival. The legal position was affirmed by a five-judge bench of the Supreme Court in a case in 1985, Ms. Jayalalithaa said" ('Anti-conversion law: no scope for revival, says Jayalalithaa' 2005, *The Hindu*, 22 May – Attachment 9).

In May 2006, the AIADMK government led by Ms Jayalalithaa was defeated by a DMK-led alliance at elections held in Tamil Nadu ('Coalition govt: A new experience for TN' 2006, *The Hindu Business Line*, 12 May – Attachment 10).

Although not in relation to conversion, a RRT research response dated 29 September 2006 provides information on whether (and how) the recent election of the DMK-led Democratic Progressive Alliance in Tamil Nadu was likely to affect the Muslim – Hindu relations in that state and the availability of state protection to Muslims who claimed harm perpetrated by Hindus. The response indicates that "Of the two dominant state political parties in Tamil Nadu, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam or DMK is considered the one more likely to act favourably to minority groups, including Muslims, when in power" (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30613*, 29 September – Attachment 11). Another RRT research response dated 15 May 2006 includes information on ethnic conflict in Tamil Nadu in respect to Muslims and the current treatment of Muslims in Tamil Nadu and their ability to access state protection (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30143*, 15 May – Attachment 12).

An article in the *Hindustan Times* dated 2 September 2005 indicates that religious conversions were "emerging as major cause of concern for the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) Government. The agenda paper prepared by the Government for the National Integration Council (NIC) meet on Wednesday attributes conversions as the one of the major cause for disturbing the communal situation in the country." According to the article:

The most distressing note in the current year was the alleged conversion activities during the annual religious assembly of the Immanuel Bible Institute Samiti, Kota (Rajasthan) in February 2005. According to the agenda paper, "The violence in Mangalore and other areas of Dakshina Kannada (Karnataka) during the second week of June, 2005 over alleged attempts to forcibly convert some Hindu girls by their Muslim employer and the terrorist attack on the disputed Rama Janmabhomi and Babri Mosque at Ayodhya, had the potential to destabilise the communal situation in the country" ('Conversions disturbing communal harmony' 2005, *Hindustan Times*, 2 September – Attachment 13).

7. Have there been any reports of Muslims in Tamil Nadu suffering harm from groups such as the VHP for involvement in converting Hindus?

The previously mentioned RRT research response dated 25 August 2006 includes information on Muslim assistance to Dalit communities in Tamil Nadu and the response of Hindu nationalist groups to the conversion of Hindu Dalits to Islam. The research response looks at the activities of Muslims helping Dalits and the relationship between Muslims and

Hindu nationalist groups such as the RSS [Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh] in Tamil Nadu. It is stated in the response that:

The conversion issue is closely tied to matters of sectarian violence and the rise of militant Hindu nationalism in Tamil Nadu and in India at large. The controversy led to a number of outbreaks of communal violence in the eighties and nineties and then, in 2002, to the institution of *The Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Forcible Conversion of Religion Ordinance* by the then ruling Tamil Nadu state government of the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) (who had come to associate themselves with the Hindu nationalist movement). Subsequent electoral setbacks saw the AIADMK repeal the law in November 2004 and, when a number of Dalit conversions to Islam followed, militant Hindu nationalist groups, and in particular the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) founded Hindu Munnani organisation, threatened to forcefully intervene in order to prevent any future conversions. Even so, no reports could be located which would indicate that any outbreaks of communal violence have ensued against Muslims involved in Dalit relief and/or conversion (although, as is noted above, pressures have been applied to such movements through police arrests) (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30453*, 25 August – Attachment 6).

The research response refers to an article in the November 2004 edition of the *South Asia Times* that indicates that within a few days of the order for “the repeal of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Forcible Conversion of Religion Act 2002, six Dalits have converted to Islam evoking strong protests from the state Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and the Hindu Munnani.” According to the article:

The founder secretary of Hindu Munnani, Mr. Rama Gopalan, said, “We are in the process of forming resistance groups in each and every village in Tamil Nadu. We have formed the Madamatraa Taduppu Kuzhu (Resistance committee against religious conversions) and we are recruiting 10 to 12 youths in every panchayat in the state.”

There are 12,000 panchayats in Tamil Nadu and the Hindu Munnai plans to recruit at least 1,50,000 youths to oppose religious conversions.

“They will keep an eye on Muslim clerics and Christian missionaries and resist them whenever they go to convert Hindus. Our men will oppose them in all forms even physically,” he said.

Asked about possible communal clashes between two religious communities, Mr. Gopalan said, “It is they (Muslims and Christians) who are entering our (Hindu) villages and provoking. In case of riots and communal clashes it will be the responsibility of the respective religious leaders trying to convert and the state government, which is acting as a blind spectator.”

According to reports reaching here, six Dalits, socially and economically backward classes among Hindus, converted to Islam at Melmandhai village in Thoothukudi district, 750 kms from here on May 23.

They said that they were embracing Islam to protest against the indignity they suffered being Hindus and to enhance their social status.

... A Chennai based organization, Tamil Nadu Development Foundation Trust, will organize a formal conversion ceremony shortly and many more Dalits are expected to convert on that day.

... Though Tamil Nadu government officials who visited the village said that they did not find any evidence of “forcible conversions”, the Hindu Munnani is up in arms against the Jayalathaa government for revoking the law banning religious conversions.

The BJP and the Hindu Munnani have decided to organize a statewide agitation on June 14 demanding the ban on conversions be re-imposed (Sharma, A. 2004, ‘Controversy over Dalit religious conversions in Ta [sic]’, *South Asia Times* online edition, November <http://www.southasiatimes.com.au/newsprint64.aspx> – Accessed 19 January 2006 – Attachment 14).

As previously mentioned, an article in *The Hindu* dated 22 May 2005 indicates that Tamil Nadu’s chief minister Ms Jayalalithaa had made “it clear that the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Forcible Conversion of Religion (TNPFCR) Act, 2002 was no longer in vogue as it was repealed through an Ordinance last year” (‘Anti-conversion law: no scope for revival, says Jayalalithaa’ 2005, *The Hindu*, 22 May – Attachment 9).

The AIADMK government led by Ms Jayalalithaa was defeated by a DMK-led alliance at elections held in Tamil Nadu in May 2006 (‘Coalition govt: A new experience for TN’ 2006, *The Hindu Business Line*, 12 May – Attachment 10).

A RRT research response dated 2 February 2006 includes information on the Tamil Nadu Development Foundation Trust [TNDFT] and how the RSS reacts to members of the TNDFT (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17769*, 2 February – Attachment 15).

8. What is the current situation for supporters of the MDMK? Do they face harm from the government or others?

As previously mentioned, the MDMK formed an alliance with the AIADMK in Tamil Nadu in March 2006. At that time, MDMK general secretary Vaiko had said “that despite the electoral ties with the AIADMK, the MDMK would be “part and parcel of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA)” at the Centre and would continue to extend issue-based support to the Manmohan Singh Government from outside just as the Left parties were doing” (‘Vaiko strikes poll alliance with AIADMK’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March – Attachment 1). In May 2006, the AIADMK lost power to a DMK-led alliance in elections held in Tamil Nadu (‘Coalition govt: A new experience for TN’ 2006, *The Hindu Business Line*, 12 May – Attachment 10).

Recent articles refer to some clashes occurring between DMK and MDMK supporters, to the south Chennai district secretary of the MDMK being arrested under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Amendment Act 2004 after making a speech at a meeting, and to MDMK general secretary Vaiko alleging that the DMK government was foisting false cases on AIADMK and MDMK cadres.

An article in *Frontline* dated 21 October - 3 November 2006 indicates that in violence at the Chennai Municipal Corporation Council elections held on 13 October 2006, candidates of the MDMK and other parties who resisted “supporters and henchmen of the ruling Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK)”, who “captured polling booths” and “drove out poll officers and party agents at knife point”, were assaulted. It is stated in the article that:

In a precisely planned operation, supporters and henchmen of the ruling Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) captured polling booths, drove out poll officers and party agents at knife

point, and the ballot boxes with ballot papers after voting for their party candidates. Candidates of the rival All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) and Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (MDMK) or even an ally like the Communist Party of India (Marxist), who resisted, were assaulted.

The article also notes that “The poll violence exposed the ineffective functioning of the State Election Commission (SEC) and the willing compliance of the police force” (Subramanian, T.S. 2006, ‘Farce in Chennai, *Frontline*, 21 October-3 November <http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=20061103003712900.htm&date=fl2321/&prd=fline&> - Accessed 2 November 2006 – Attachment 16).

An article in *The Hindu* dated 1 November 2006 refers to police arresting “five persons, said to be MDMK party workers, on charges of assaulting DMK party men.” It is stated in the article that:

According to sources, the trouble began when a mechanic Ganesan, a DMK party worker was assaulted allegedly by MDMK cadres. Upon learning about the attack, Rajamanickam, a DMK union youth wing secretary, along with a few party workers went to MDMK panchayat union vice president Muthumani’s house. There, a wordy duel turned into a fisticuff and Muthumani’s men allegedly bashed up Rajamanickam’s men, sources said (‘Five arrested’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 1 November – Attachment 17).

According to an article dated 20 August 2006, “The south Chennai district secretary of the MDMK “Velacheri” Manimaran” had been “arrested under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Amendment Act 2004 and remanded to judicial custody” after making a speech at a meeting in Nungambakkam. The police press note “quoted the MDMK functionary Manimaran as stating in his address that to uplift the Eelam Tamils, “We will take any step to protect the people there. If the Sri Lankan Government continued its attack against the innocent Tamils, we will be compelled to retaliate and would be forced to even use weapons like AK-47.”” It is stated in the article that “The DPI [Dalit Panthers of India] treasurer Kadamban, had also made some antinational remarks. As the speeches were seen as provocative and posing a threat to the security and challenged the country’s unity, the police arrested Manimaran.” The article indicates that “In protest against the arrest, MDMK supporters picketed before the Nungambakkam police station in the afternoon. The police picked up nine of them.” The “MDMK general secretary Vaiko condemned the action” (‘Held for inflammatory speech’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 20 August – Attachment 18).

An article dated 15 July 2006 refers to comments by MDMK general secretary Vaiko, who said that the alliance between the AIADMK and the MDMK would “continue for the local body elections”. Vaiko had also said that “The DMK government was victimising AIADMK and MDMK cadres by foisting false cases on them” (‘Alliance with AIADMK will continue: Vaiko’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 15 July <http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=2006071514610400.htm&date=2006/07/15/&prd=th&> - Accessed 2 November 2006 – Attachment 19).

Another article dated 26 May 2006 also notes that Vaiko had “charged that false cases were being foisted on the MDMK and the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam cadres.” According to the article, “Mr. Vaiko said that though Chief Minister M. Karunanidhi had promised that there would be no witch hunting against the Opposition, the assurance did not translate into action. His party men were, however, not afraid of facing the foisted cases” (‘Cases being foisted on cadre: Vaiko’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 26 May – Attachment 20).

An article dated 24 May 2006 refers to MDMK and AIADMK members of parliament meeting with “Prime Minister Manmohan Singh” and pleading “for ordering police protection to MDMK general secretary Vaiko and his family who, they said, were facing threats to their lives” (‘Order security to Vaiko: AIADMK, MDMK urge PM’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 24 May

<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=2006052407351200.htm&date=2006/05/24/&prd=th&> - Accessed 2 November 2006 – Attachment 21).

Copies of the attachments to RRT *Research Response IND30201* dated 22 May 2006 are attached (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30201*, 22 May – Attachment 22).

Also attached are earlier RRT research responses *IND23286* dated 12 March 2004 and *IND22997* dated 30 April 2003, which include information in relation to the treatment of MDMK supporters (RRT Country Research 2004, *Research Response IND23286*, 12 March – Attachment 23); (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND22997*, 30 April – Attachment 24).

9. How did the MDMK perform at the 2006 Tamil Nadu election?

A document on the Election Commission of India website indicates that the MDMK won six seats out of the 35 seats it contested at the 2006 Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly general election (Election Commission of India 2006, ‘Key Highlights of General Election, 2006 to the Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu’, Election Commission of India website, p. 11 http://www.eci.gov.in/SR_KeyHighLights/key_highlights.asp - Accessed 2 November 2006 – Attachment 25).

As previously mentioned, the MDMK had formed an alliance with the AIADMK in Tamil Nadu in March 2006 (‘Vaiko strikes poll alliance with AIADMK’ 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March – Attachment 1). In May 2006, a DMK-led alliance replaced the AIADMK government in elections held in Tamil Nadu. The AIADMK won only 61 seats in the 234-member Assembly, while its allies, the MDMK and the VCK [Viduthalai Chiruthaigal Katch] won six seats and two seats respectively (‘Coalition govt: A new experience for TN’ 2006, *The Hindu Business Line*, 12 May – Attachment 10).

List of Sources Consulted

Internet Sources:

Government Information & Reports

Immigration & Refugee Board of Canada <http://www.irb-cisr.gc.ca/>

UK Home Office <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/>

US Department of State <http://www.state.gov/>

United Nations (UN)

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) website

<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/taxis/vtx/rsd>

Non-Government Organisations

Human Rights Watch <http://www.hrw.org/>

Amnesty International website <http://www.amnesty.org>

International News & Politics

BBC News <http://news.bbc.co.uk>

Region Specific Links

Election Commission of India website <http://www.eci.gov.in/>

Search Engines

Copernic <http://www.copernic.com/>

Databases:

FACTIVA (news database)

BACIS (DIMA Country Information database)

REFINFO (IRBDC (Canada) Country Information database)

ISYS (RRT Country Research database, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, US Department of State Reports)

RRT Library Catalogue

List of Attachments

1. 'Vaiko strikes poll alliance with AIADMK' 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March. (FACTIVA)
2. 'Vaiko joins Jaya ranks' 2006, *The Statesman*, 5 March. (FACTIVA)
3. 'MDMK cadres happy' 2006, *The Hindu*, 5 March. (FACTIVA)
4. '75 DMK members join AIADMK' 2006, *The Hindu*, 2 April. (FACTIVA)
5. US Department of State 2006, *International Religious Freedom Report 2006 – India*, September.
6. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30453*, 25 August.
7. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17783*, 6 February.
8. Kumar, Sampath 2004, 'Jayalalitha makes sudden U-turn', *BBC News*, 18 May http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/3725231.stm - Accessed 2 November 2006.
9. 'Anti-conversion law: no scope for revival, says Jayalalithaa' 2005, *The Hindu*, 22 May. (FACTIVA)
10. 'Coalition govt: A new experience for TN' 2006, *The Hindu Business Line*, 12 May. (FACTIVA)
11. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30613*, 29 September.
12. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30143*, 15 May.
13. 'Conversions disturbing communal harmony' 2005, *Hindustan Times*, 2 September. (FACTIVA)
14. Sharma, A. 2004, 'Controversy over Dalit religious conversions in Ta [sic]', *South Asia Times* online edition, November <http://www.southasiatimes.com.au/newsprint64.aspx> – Accessed 19 January 2006.

15. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND17769*, 2 February.
16. Subramanian, T.S. 2006, 'Farce in Chennai, *Frontline*, 21 October-3 November
<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=20061103003712900.htm&date=fl2321/&prd=fline&> - Accessed 2 November 2006.
17. 'Five arrested' 2006, *The Hindu*, 1 November. (FACTIVA)
18. 'Held for inflammatory speech' 2006, *The Hindu*, 20 August. (FACTIVA)
19. 'Alliance with AIADMK will continue: Vaiko' 2006, *The Hindu*, 15 July
<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=2006071514610400.htm&date=2006/07/15/&prd=th&> - Accessed 2 November 2006.
20. 'Cases being foisted on cadre: Vaiko' 2006, *The Hindu*, 26 May. (FACTIVA)
21. 'Order security to Vaiko: AIADMK, MDMK urge PM' 2006, *The Hindu*, 24 May
<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/thscrip/print.pl?file=2006052407351200.htm&date=2006/05/24/&prd=th&> - Accessed 2 November 2006.
22. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Response IND30201*, 22 May.
23. RRT Country Research 2004, *Research Response IND23286*, 12 March.
24. RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response IND22997*, 30 April.
25. Election Commission of India 2006, 'Key Highlights of General Election, 2006 to the Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu', Election Commission of India website
http://www.eci.gov.in/SR_KeyHighLights/key_highlights.asp - Accessed 2 November 2006.